

COMMON GROUND



NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 1984

VOLUME 1 NUMBER 2

ISSN 0890-4065



FROM A 13th CENTURY LATIN PSALTER
executed for the Benedictine Abbey at Evesham.

(By courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum)

Front Cover: Winter Sunshine at Coffinswell, South Devon.

(Reece Winstone)

COMMON GROUND

VOLUME VIII NUMBER 6

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1954

PUBLISHED BY THE COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

KINGSWAY CHAMBERS, 162A, STRAND, LONDON. W.C.2

MAIN CONTENTS

| | | |
|---|-----------|--------------------|
| The Pharisees and Their Achievement | - - - - - | T. Francis Glasson |
| Co-existence and Co-operation | - - - - - | Leo Baeck |
| The Basis of Co-operation between Jews and Christians | - | Francis H. House |
| Religious Education and Human Understanding | - - - - - | E. L. Allen |

Signed articles express the views of the contributors which are not necessarily those of the Council of Christians and Jews.

The Pharisees and Their Achievement

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

The Rev. T. F. Glasson, M.A., D.D., is Minister of Horley Methodist Church. Dr. Glasson, who is a member of the Council of Christians and Jews, has made a special study of Jewish and Christian Eschatology, and is the author of several books.

A WELL-KNOWN historian of the Christian Church, F. J. Foakes Jackson in his *History of the Christian Church*, affirms that "the Pharisaic party was the representative of a noble effort to reform Judaism." The purpose of this article is to attempt to indicate the positive aims and achievements of this effort, so as to gain a more balanced view than the one still current in some circles. Instead of dwelling on one brief period, it is necessary to go back to the second century B.C., when Pharisaism took its rise, and on to the second century A.D., when it was passing into the definitive forms of rabbinic piety and faith which have remained to the present time

It is usually thought that the Pharisees continued the work of the Chasidim who played a notable part in the Maccabean struggle and who are mentioned three times in 1 and 2 Maccabees (1 Macc. ii. 42ff; vii. 12ff; 2 Macc. xiv. 6). Nothing more is heard of them once the victory for orthodox Judaism had been won; and as it is at that point that the Pharisees emerge, it seems that the Chasidim gradually developed into the Pharisaic party which was characterised by the same zeal for the Law. The importance of the Pharisees at this critical period can hardly be exaggerated.

It was necessary to take somewhat severe measures to safeguard the priceless heritage of Israel, and they accordingly "put a fence around the Law," preventing loss of identity by assimilation—a danger the nation had so narrowly escaped in the immediate past.

Religion in everyday life

The Pharisees sought to apply the will of God to every part of daily life. Their detailed enactments saved the great prophetic realities from being left as remote ideals, and brought them into the humdrum realm of practical affairs. The rich coal-seams of Old Testament revelation were reduced, as it were, to the kitchen-nuts of everyday life. The Pharisaic "tradition" was not intended to supersede the original Law but to make it plastic and to adapt it to changing circumstances and developing conditions. In addition to decisions on moral issues, there were the specifically religious rites and usages—"the web of fast and festival, symbol and ceremony that make up Jewish life." There is of course a danger (facing both Christian and Jew) of guarding the case more than the contents, of a loss of due proportion, of forgetting the end in the means. But there is another danger of losing religion altogether in vague aspirations and failing to relate it intimately to the happenings of material life. We who are Christians find in the Incarnation a warrant for the hallowing of material and bodily life. The doctrine of Creation also leads us to this comprehensive principle, and here we are at one with Israel. As C. G. Montefiore has said in his work *Truth in Religion*, "There is no more Jewish sentiment than the injunction of St. Paul: Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." It was through Pharisaism that the Jewish meal-table became an altar.

Pharisees in the Synagogue

While the synagogue was not their invention, the Pharisees adopted it as the most powerful means available in bringing their principles to the rank and file of the people. This was vital for the future of Judaism, for when the Temple was destroyed the synagogues with their spiritual worship remained. The synagogue was also a model for the Christian Church, which adopted its use of psalms, prayers, affirmation of faith, scripture reading and exposition.

Pharisaic teachers (who were laymen and not a priestly order) did not receive payment for their teaching, and they earned their living by following some occupation. "An excellent thing is the study of the Torah combined with some worldly occupation, for the labour demanded

by them both makes sin to be forgotten." In illustration of this we may recall that Hillel was a woodcutter, Shammai a builder, others were blacksmiths, shoemakers, tentmakers and carpenters.

It was the Pharisees who after the Maccabean struggle were the upholders of true religion. Of the Hasmonean and Roman periods W. O. E. Oesterley says:

Whatever faults they may have developed it is but bare justice to record that had it not been for the Pharisees the Jewish religion, with the eternal truths which it taught, would have disappeared . . . As the upholders of the ethical teaching of the Law, and in inculcating this among their followers, they were doing a work of inestimable worth and of permanent value. In addition to this it is important to remember that in their doctrinal teaching they were preserving all that was best in Judaism. (*W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson: History of Israel*).

They upheld monotheism; and "in their teaching on the future life, again, the Pharisees were doing a work of immense importance." "To the Pharisees was also due the upholding of personal religion—inculcating the sense of sin, the need of repentance, of grace and forgiveness."

Schools of Pharisees

During the first century of our era, there was a certain amount of division in the Pharisaic movement principally between the schools of Hillel and Shammai. This is an important point to remember, especially in interpreting the New Testament references. According to the article on the Pharisees in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* "the polemic of Jesus in the Gospels was primarily directed not against the party as a whole, but against one section of it, an extreme wing of the followers of Shammai . . . It is probable that the Shammaites were in the ascendant at this time; later, after A.D. 70, the milder peace-loving school of Hillel predominated." G. F. Moore, in his work *Judaism*, says of these two schools:

It seems that in the middle decades of our first century the Shammaites were the more numerous, as well as the more aggressive, and it was perhaps only after the fall of Jerusalem that the Hillelites gained the ascendancy . . . The dissidence of these two schools may be regarded as an inner crisis in the history of Pharisaism, from which the more progressive tendency emerged superior.

It is worth noting that Dr. J. H. Hertz, the late Chief Rabbi, wrote that "Shammai lacked patience and was not of a conciliatory nature." In the Mishnah, one tractate refers to eighteen restrictive decrees adopted at a meeting in which the Shammaites outnumbered the Hillelites.



RUINS OF THE SECOND CENTURY SYNAGOGUE
AT TEL-HUM (CAPERNAUM?), GALILEE.

(By courtesy of Dr. Cecil Roth and the East & West Library)

If then, the Shammaites were so strong in the first century, we must take this into account in assessing various estimates of the Pharisees found in the new Testament. Not that the New Testament is uniformly hostile by any means. There are favourable pictures of Nicodemus and others. Gamaliel, whose wise tolerance is evident from the glimpse of him we have in Acts v.34-40, belonged to the Hillelite wing and was in fact Hille's grandson. According to Acts xxii.3 he was the instructor of Paul; this has been disputed, but the statement of Acts is strongly defended by the Jewish scholar, Klausner, in his work *From Jesus to Paul*.

It is important to notice that in the earliest of our Gospels, St. Mark, the word Pharisee does not occur after xii.13. The references to them suddenly cease at the Passion story, while at that point most of the references to the chief priests begin. There were, of course, Pharisees on the Sanhedrin but the leading officers of this body were priests, who were mostly Sadducees. It seems clear that the prime movers were "the chief priests" (Mark xv.10).

When the tragedy of A.D. 70 took place, it was the Pharisees who saved Judaism. According to one account Johanan ben Zakkai was taken out of Jerusalem in a coffin, when it was clear that resistance to the Roman armies was useless. At Jabneh (Jamnia) near the coast he formed a new rallying centre. It is said that he comforted his mourning disciples with the saying that the loss of the Sanctuary by removing the sacrifices had not deprived Israel of the means of atonement. Charity remained. And charity here means loving-kindness, for he cites Hosea vi.6: I desire loving-kindness and not sacrifice.

Outstanding Pharisees

Johanan was a Hillelite and, as Moore says, his influence and that of his disciples "contributed much to the ultimate predominance of the Hillelites." One of his colleagues was Ben Azzai, author of the fine saying, "the reward of a good deed is a good deed and the wages of sin is sin." It is in considering men like Johanan and in studying their sayings that we can perhaps best appreciate the ideals of Pharisaism. Instead of trying to assess parties and movements, one gains a clearer picture by dwelling upon concrete personalities. Those who do this will assuredly agree with the great Dean Farrar who wrote in his book on St. Paul:

among many other stately figures who walk in a peace and righteousness worthy of the race which sprang from Abraham, we see the lovable and noble characters of a Hillel, of a Simeon, of a Chaja, of a Judah "the Holy." It was when he thought of such as these, that, even long after his conversion, Paul could exclaim before the Sanhedrin with no sense of shame or contradiction—"Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees."

On the same page Farrar refers to Hillel as "a humane thoughtful high-minded and religious man."

It was Hillel who made the great declaration, "What is hateful unto thee, do it not to thy fellowman; this is the whole Torah, the rest is commentary." Again, Hillel said, "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving mankind, and bringing them near to

the Torah." Gamaliel I, already referred to, was his grandson; and the grandson of the latter was Gamaliel II who succeeded Johanan ben Zakkai as Nasi (or President) in the year 80. The grandson of Gamaliel II was Judah the Prince (known as Rabbi), the editor of the Mishnah, the seventh in descent from Hillel. When we look at this succession and consider not only their words but also what they did and suffered, we cannot withhold our admiration or regard them as other than men of genuine piety, faith and courage.

Co-existence and Co-operation

LEO BAECK

The following two articles are summaries of the first lectures given by leading Christian and Jewish thinkers under the general title, "The Scope and Limitations of Co-operation between Jews and Christians," the course being organised by the London Society of Jews and Christians. Dr. Leo Baeck was formerly a Rabbi in Berlin, and is Honorary Life President of the World Union for Progressive Judaism.

THE general problem which impresses and sustains the special question with which we have to deal is the problem of co-operation. What is the meaning of this term "co-operation," which is frequently used and sometimes a little hastily applied? In order to answer this, it seems advisable first to approach another conception, that on which the conception of co-operation is based and in which it is contained, namely, the conception of co-existence, particularly in so far as it concerns our subject, co-existence in religious witness. For only if and when co-existence is achieved, can co-operation begin. That is to say: only if and when the place of the other's right and, thereby, his right to his place are recognised, can and will co-operation set in.

Co-existence is the problem of the individual. The individual, day by day, sees and hears the other, and somehow he feels the compression of that other. But one day, he becomes aware that the other is not as bad, as improper, nor as stupid as, in the beginning, he thought. He becomes a neighbour and co-existence begins. The neighbouring tasks advance and so co-operation begins. Co-operation means the acknowledgment and fulfilment of neighbouring tasks, in order that gradually they shall be considered as common tasks.

In regard to co-operation, the community is in a more difficult position. Communities are known to one another only indirectly, so to speak, by proxy. Moreover, the community is both more rigid and unyielding than the individual, and the conscience of the community

moves more slowly than that of the individual. There is some truth in the old Roman saying, "The senators are fine gentlemen, but the Senate is a bad beast." But this is the task: to be the distinct individual and, at the same time, the good neighbour. Only in this way may it be possible to bring about co-existence and, eventually, co-operation.

History shows this. In antiquity, the problem of co-existence did not arise in the religious field. In the Middle Ages, it was known, but not acknowledged. It did not arise in antiquity because paganism did not claim exclusiveness. Judaism did claim some exclusiveness, but only in a restricted measure, since Judaism acknowledged in other peoples righteousness, piety and a share in the world to come. In the Middle Ages, the Church claimed exclusiveness and the problem arose but it was not acknowledged. Not until the beginning of modern times was the problem of co-existence recognised. In the Peace Treaty of Westphalia, co-existence of Roman Catholics and Protestants was, for the first time, legally acknowledged and gradually co-operation began. But the real step to a solution of the problem, and towards the more enlightened age of modern times was taken about forty years later, in 1689, in this country by the passing of the Tolerance Act. By this Act, the seed was sown of true co-existence and co-operation in the religious field, a seed from which the Council of Christians and Jews also eventually grew up.

The basic meaning of this Act was that the other religious community was recognised not only as the *other* one but also as the neighbour, i.e. an individual body and at the same time, a neighbour. That is the meaning of co-existence in the field of religion, and it is also the foundation of religious co-operation. That day, the day of this great gift of the English genius to humanity, marked the beginning of a new era.

Range of Co-operation

Co-operation in religious witness is the particular subject for present consideration. The basis of this problem is the question whether there is only one witness of the Lord, or whether there are perhaps a number of witnesses of the Lord. It could also be put thus: is there only one approach to the truth and to salvation, or perhaps several approaches, several avenues? Has revelation only one voice, one language, or perhaps several voices, several languages? It is a difficult question. Everyone who believes is convinced that his religion is *the* religion, his faith *the* faith, that he is *the* witness of truth and of salvation. Moreover, only he who has such a conviction will understand and respect

the other's conviction. It may seem paradoxical, but it is so. He who is convinced, deeply and fully convinced, will perhaps one day think over this question, and say to himself: "The Lord's thoughts are not my thoughts, and my ways are not the ways of the Lord."

There is a part of divine providence that is called true history. History means the history of many peoples, many nations. History of one nation would be a contradiction in terms. There are different nations, there are different convictions, distinct philosophies and, perhaps, distinct voices of religious truth. Truth is one; but from the human being to the divine truth there are different avenues, different approaches. Truth is one, but men are different; and therefore the access, the approaches, may be different. Everyone is a potential witness, and until he really *is* a witness showing and proving how he is influenced by his faith, how he is shaped and formed by his religion, only then is he a witness of the One Truth. There may be different witnesses, witnesses that can and should be co-existent and, by virtue of such co-existence, they may one day co-operate. This provides the ground, the range, the scope of co-operation.

Limits of Co-operation

But there are also limitations. Co-operation can be manifested in all the activities of the witness, in all that the witness does—mainly in the sphere of the Commandments—of all the human and ordinary tasks, the tasks that are without end. A problem is only solved when it is felt to be fertile, and pregnant of the future. Here is the field for co-operation, because here is the field of true co-existence; each person being an individual, a distinct individual, and, at the same time, a neighbour, and a good neighbour. This is religious neighbourliness. But it does not imply religious partnership; and this distinction indicates the scope and the limitations of co-operation.

There cannot be religious partnership. To the faithful, his religion is *the* religion and, by virtue of this, quite especially, he can become a good neighbour; but he will not have his neighbour who is a dissenter, a man of another belief, to be the partner in his religion. They, therefore, cannot together form a community in divine Service. A Service is at the same time a confession of faith as well as a Service. It is truly a Service only if and when, and so long as, it is a shared confession of faith. My faith is my faith, and the other's faith is his faith. Of course, men of different beliefs can stand together and thank God for all the benefits which He has wrought. There can be common Thanksgiving. People

of different creeds can stand together remembering all the dangers, and the days of trial, which they have shared. There also can be common days of Remembrance. People of different faiths can stand together and pray, "The Lord is my Shepherd," "The Lord shall keep thy going out and thy coming in;" but that is not a communal Service. Such is the limitation of co-operation and co-existence in religious witness.

Mystery is the root of faith

It was a great day when different religions remembered God, and all wished to pray to God. It was a great day when not only the neighbours, the individuals who understood one another, but religious bodies, religious corporations, began to acknowledge one another. But every acknowledgment of the other means at the same time acknowledgment of mystery. Mystery is the foundation of all religion. Mystery is the root of religious witness. To science, mystery is something on the periphery. One day, somewhere, science becomes faced with the secret. To the religious man, mystery is the centre. Mystery is the root of the faith. He who has become conscious of the mystery within himself, will begin to recognise, to respect, the mystery within the other. One mystery, but different beliefs, each of which has its own voice, signify the scope and limitations of co-operation in religious witness.

Ultimate Objective

The purpose and the goal is to become aware of the mystery in the soul of the other, the mystery of his faith. And then, by grasping the mystery, so to speak by virtue of the mystery, we shall be able and ready to give him recognition, to acknowledge the place of his right and his right to his place. By virtue of this co-existence, we shall become aware of the neighbour's task that one day will be acknowledged as a common task. Different persons, each in his own way, will try to fulfil the task. They will co-operate, and the blessing will then be one. He who is able and ready to hear will, time and again, be moved by the fact that the words of the blessing are the same in the Church and in the Synagogue. The church is a church and the synagogue is a synagogue. Christianity is Christianity by the grace of God, by virtue of the mystery; and Judaism is Judaism by the grace of God, by virtue of the mystery. Not in spite of that, but through that, and on the strength of that, they will really co-exist; and they will co-operate. And through this co-existence and this co-operation, they will be blessed by Almighty God, and blessed also the one by the other, and blessed by virtue of religious witness.



A HAGGADAH MS, WRITTEN BY ABRAHAM
THE SCRIBE OF EIRINGER, 1650.

(By courtesy of the Jewish Museum)

The Basis of Co-operation between Jews and Christians

FRANCIS H. HOUSE

Rev. Francis H. House is Head of Religious Broadcasting, B.B.C.

ON the broad basis of what used to be called "natural religion," i.e., belief in the existence of God, the moral law and the future life, there is ground for elementary unity of action between Christians and Jews. It is shared indeed by many "men of goodwill" who are not committed Christians or Jews, although they are deeply influenced by the Judaeo-Christian foundations of our civilisation.

In our time there is deep division, often amounting to open hostility, between those who as secular humanists or Marxists reject any theistic foundation of human life or moral standards, and those who, as Jews or Christians, share a common belief in One God, the Creator and Father of all. Secular humanists on the one side and Christians and Jews on the other may both subscribe to apparently similar ideals of "harmony, peace, love, justice and brotherhood," but great differences begin to appear as soon as the practical application of these ideals has to be considered. Thus, Karl Stern the psychiatrist noted in his autobiography the extraordinary extent to which many men who were revolted by the brutal and wholesale methods used under the Nazis for the sterilisation or euthenasia of the feeble-minded and unfit, yet, because their own basic philosophy of life was essentially secular and pragmatic, saw no reason in principle why other communities should not take like brutal measures to achieve similar ends. "In a non-dictatorial environment," he wrote, "we are clinging to many patterns because of a Christian heritage of which we are no longer conscious, and not because we actually believe in the Christian doctrine of vicarious suffering . . . or simply in man's immortal soul. In fact, most of us do not believe in these things. Thus we cling with one hand to modern pragmatism, and with the other to the Hebrew-Christian philosophy. But the gap is widening all the time, and there will be a moment when one hand will have to let go."

Scope for co-operation

My point is that when such an issue arises, believing Christians and Jews find themselves co-operating on deeper grounds than mere humanitarianism. It is their common religious faith which unites them against the pragmatism and hedonism of those to whom they are opposed. My further contention would be that it would be a great advantage if Jewish and Christian co-operation more often took such a form, that

the specifically *religious* basis of their reactions to these and other sociological manifestations of much contemporary secularism were much more explicitly manifested and affirmed. I fully agree with Rabbi Leslie Edgar when he writes that "The gravest danger to our civilisation . . . is degeneration from within—the complete secularisation and dehumanising of our society—from the loss of a spiritual outlook and an effective religious philosophy. Co-operation among the monotheistic faiths . . . would be an immense step towards the re-inspiring of our civilisation with a religious outlook. On that achievement, the whole future of our civilisation depends." Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck was, I believe, saying something very similar when he wrote: "In a time when all religious life is endangered by secularism, the Jewish principle of the relentless Divine imperative *Thou Shalt* is an extraordinarily important factor in the spiritual and cultural situation in the world."

On the Christian side, I may instance the fact that a large part of what was said in a course of People's Services broadcast in the Light Programme under the simple titles, "God is," "God Rules," and "God Cares," could have been given, as far as the content of the talks was concerned, equally well by Jewish as by Christian speakers. It is also, I think, part of what Dr. James Parkes is saying in his provocative book, *Judaism and Christianity*, when he writes of the tragedy of the rejection by the followers of Jesus of "the real essentials of Sinai, a rejection which has left the Church impotent in the face of the breakdown of the modern world."

I would venture, therefore, to suggest that the first area for fruitful co-operation between Christians and Jews is in further work along the lines of the statement on "Fundamental Postulates of Judaism and Christianity in relation to Human Order," with its declaration that "the basic motive for ethical conduct is man's response to God as He makes Himself known in His wisdom and goodness."

Study and teaching of the Old Testament

But the question before us is whether we ought not to go together considerably further than this into the realm of revealed religion. The starting point for my own thinking about this possible advance is our common Judaeo-Christian belief in God's calling of his people in history. It is indeed true that the Christian reading of the Old Testament record is profoundly influenced by the revelation of the New Testament, and that some recent Christian scholarship has strongly emphasised "this revaluation through the Christological principle." Nevertheless, in an age in which many men implicitly or explicitly reject the whole conception of divine

intervention in human history, there is a great deal of the Old Testament on which Jews and Christians can bear common witness to the world without blurring essential distinctions. It may be that we can and should bear that common witness at quite popular levels. For example, Karl Stern's observation that "Most Christians as well as Jews have forgotten about the spiritual meaning of their feasts" is certainly true of a multitude of nominal Christians. But some knowledge of the real meaning of Jewish feasts, even the simple ones such as Chanukkah and, supremely, the Passover, can provide new starting points for thoughts about God's action in history for Christians as well as Jews. It is for this reason that the Religious Broadcasting Department of the B.C.C. has warmly welcomed the idea that talks by the Chief Rabbi on the eve of major Jewish Festivals should be addressed not to Jews only, but to the listening public in general.

The Prophets and Psalms in Christian Worship

On the Christian side, too, it might be valuable if sometimes, something more explicit were said to ordinary congregations about the significance of the fact that, in every act of Christian worship, there are readings from the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms. Even though, as Christians, we naturally read the Old Testament through the eyes of the New, the great Old Testament revelations of the righteousness and mercy of God in the Prophets, and the marvellous expressions of the response of men and women to that revelation in the Psalms, imply the existence of a vastly wider field of common belief and experience between Christians and Jews than most Christians are aware of. Once a man's attention has been drawn to it, there is immense significance for Jewish-Christian relations and their common witness in such a simple thing as the habitual recitation in Christian Services of the Ten Commandments and "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind, and strength . . . and thy neighbour as thyself."

The Church's Hebraic Heritage

Again, in the realm of theological study, one may refer also to the widespread tendency among Christian theologians of very diverse schools of thought to re-emphasise the Hebraic as distinct from the Greek heritage in Christian theology. This development is so well known that I need cite only two examples. The first is from Bishop Stephen Neill, who is particularly concerned with the worldwide Christian mission. In *The Church and the Jewish People* he writes:

The divisions within the Christian Church are grave enough, but the gravest schism of all was the earliest—that which took place when the Church and Synagogue . . . decided to take their separate ways. Since that time an essential element in the life of the Church has been grievously lacking. The Church has indeed accepted the Old Testament as part of its sacred Scriptures, has read and expounded and tried to understand it. But the main influence in the development of Christian thought was Greek. The debt of western Christendom to the Greeks is immense, and almost all Christian thinking is carried on within the categories determined by the Greek Christian thinkers. But what came at the start as an illumination has tended to harden into an imprisonment; the Greek categories are irrelevant or worse when the concern of the Church is to make itself at home in China, or India, or among primitive peoples. It may be that the difficulty the Church has certainly experienced in becoming a universal Church is in part due to the intellectualisation of its thought under Greek influences, and that a large-scale recovery of the more direct, more concrete, more personal approach of the Hebrew mind is needed, if the Church is ever to fulfil its destiny as the spiritual home for all peoples.

That passage illustrates a trend in Christian thinking which is very relevant to our discussion. My second example is Father Lev Gillet's book *Communion in the Messiah* which strongly stresses what the Church can learn from the Synagogue and Jewish tradition. This is all the more striking since the author is a priest of the Eastern Orthodox or Greek Catholic Church.

Religion in community life

In trying to sum up what Christian theologians have in mind when they speak of the need to recover the Hebraic tradition as a complement to the Greek, I should say that they emphasise particularly the personal activity of God over against the more rationalistic, abstract thought of Prime Mover, or First Cause: that they have deep sympathies with Martin Buber's emphasis on the fundamental nature of the "I—Thou" relationship, and that they perceive great value in the Hebraic stress on the corporate, social nature of religious life and its necessary expression in moral action and the life of the community—over against more exclusively individualistic tendencies in Christian thought. This may perhaps point to some practical possibilities of more fruitful co-operation between Christian and Jewish theologians in the study of the Old Testament, despite the severe limits set by the necessarily Christocentric character of all Christian studies.

To sum up this section: My personal belief is that deeper religious co-operation between Christians and Jews is possible and valuable at

two levels: first, that of measures to increase popular understanding of the basic beliefs of the two faiths, and second, that of fruitful interchange between theologians to their enrichment.

Conditions of Co-operation

My third point concerns the limitations rather than the scope of co-operation. Religious co-operation between Christians and Jews cannot go far without coming up against the scandal of the Cross. No amount of good feeling, no degree of "liberalisation" consistent with the integrity of the Christian and Jewish faiths, and no penitence, however deeply felt, by Christians for their treatment of the Jewish people in the past, can remove our basic differences of belief or should be allowed to obscure them.

The fundamental condition of co-operation in the religious field should be complete honesty on both sides—a willingness to take account of the existence of deep and, humanly speaking, irreconcilable elements in our respective beliefs. Moreover, we must be prepared to recognise, as the founders of this Society have always recognised, that Christians cannot renounce the obligation to seek to preach the Gospel to all peoples, even though they may rightly be challenged to renounce all unworthy methods of proselytism. Moreover, on the Churches' side, as the debates at the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston revealed, there is a serious and at present unresolved division of opinion among Christian theologians regarding the interpretation of God's promise to the people of Israel and, until some more common thinking about the question has been done by Christians of different traditions, Judaeo-Christian theological co-operation will be handicapped by serious uncertainties.

Common witness to Revelation

There is no doubt that the difficulties in the path of further measures for religious co-operation are very great. Nevertheless, I think we should make it clear to our fellow believers that we cannot be content to co-operate only on the level of mutual aid and the promotion of human ideals of tolerance and of human personality; rather, in face of a despairing and distracted world, we can and must learn from one another and bear witness together to those basic truths of God's Revelation which we hold in common. I am sure that, in so doing, we shall be giving fresh empirical proof of the conviction that "the dynamics of spiritual development are constantly fed and upheld by the dialectic antithesis between Synagogue and Church."

Religious Education and Human Understanding

E. L. ALLEN

Dr. Allen gave the opening address at the Conference on Religious Textbooks, held by the Council of Christians and Jews in October, 1954. The Rev. Dr. E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., is Lecturer in Theology at the University of Durham, and is the author of many theological works.

THE people gathered here today represent a considerable diversity of opinion. It must be clear that we are not attempting in any way to whittle down the honest differences of opinion between us; within the terms of reference of the conference we accept those differences as final. We brought them here and we shall take our particular loyalties away with us. Some are here as teachers in the work of schools belonging to a particular community, representing a particular religious tradition to which the scholars belong, and to which we give our own allegiance. Others are in the employ of a Local Education Authority and have the delicate task of communicating conviction without indulging in propaganda.

We realise, I am sure, that those differences between us have been responsible in the past for some tragic episodes and that in the present they produce, from time to time, suspicion and ill will. Our task, therefore, as I see it, is to prevent any repetition of those tragic episodes in the past, a past incidentally that is not very far away from us. We also want to find out what are the causes and the reasons why our differences in this field of religious conviction do sometimes produce misunderstanding, ill will and suspicion, and having found what those causes are, to see how we can eliminate them.

On the positive side what we want to do is to see our differences in such a way that they will not militate against sound personal relationships, that they will not prevent our co-operating in the common tasks of the community to which we belong.

Internal and External perspectives

In religious education we must try to give what we have seen and believe for ourselves, but we must try so to give it that we do not outrage the convictions and the feelings of people who see and believe differently from ourselves. I am going to suggest one principle which will help us in this, and that is to remember that no position is ever quite the same to the person who rejects it and to the person who accepts it. Internal and external perspectives are always different.

Take the programme of the Labour Party. It is not the same thing to Mr. Attlee and Sir Winston Churchill. They react to it in different ways, yet there is no reason to deny that they are both honest men, concerned with the common good. Yet neither of these perspectives can be ruled out as wrong. If I am trying to win an election for a party, I shall go all out to win that election for my own particular party. If, on the other hand, I am taking an adult class, I shall regard it as my duty to help persons who belong to one political party to see the programmes of the other political party as the members of that party themselves see it.

Differing religious traditions

As a Protestant whose duty is to take classes in subjects like the Bible and Christian doctrine, it is my duty to help my students to see as far as possible Catholicism and Judaism as the devout Catholic and the loyal Jew see them, and I would hope that my Catholic and Jewish colleagues would do the same for their part. Let me try to illustrate what I mean.

Take the case of Judaism. It is commonplace, of course, that the translation of the word *Torah* by *Lex*, *Nomos*, Law, is unfortunate in the extreme. Law does not mean to us what *Torah* means to the devout Jew. It does not mean merely a set of rules which you must keep; but revelation, instruction, guidance—the guidance of a father to his children. To us the 365 commands and 243 prohibitions seem an intolerable burden. To the Jew it is an indication that every day in the year brings its particular opportunity of serving God, with every member of the human body, every limb of the body, and that every aspect of human life should be devoted to Him. Seen in that way it takes on quite another character.

Catholic and Protestant beliefs

Take, again, the basic Protestant principle of justification by faith. To those who reject this principle it appears as highly immoral, as though it did not matter what one's conduct were, or that religion could be reduced to a set of private emotions. Now the Protestant draws a distinction between what we are to aim at and what we are to trust in. We are to aim at the highest in moral conduct; we do not put our trust in our achievement, but in the mercy of God, so that while we must do all that is commanded, when we have finished we do not in the presence of God ask to be rewarded, we ask to be forgiven. The controversy,

of course, is very largely a matter of words. Neither justification nor faith means to the one party what it means to the other.

Finally, among Protestants there is a general notion as they look at the Catholic Church that she represents a group of men who claim infallibility for themselves and who lay down what other people are to believe, requiring from them simply blind submission. But as I take it, no Catholic thinks of Christ and the Church as different. The Church is the body of Christ, the sphere in which he works and in which he speaks to Christians. And while the Protestant may be disposed to fix his attention upon the structure of Catholic dogma as it has been brought to the present point, and think of everything as settled, the intelligent Catholic may be wondering all the time about the large area that is open to discussion and even to controversy.

In such ways, I think, we learn to see a tradition other than our own as it appears to those who are actually within it.

Christian Schools and the Jewish community

I now come to the second part of what I have to say, where I shall be concerned with one particular problem, that of the impact of religious education as given in Christian schools upon Judaism and the Jewish community. I would say frankly that we Christians need to approach this whole question in a spirit of shame and penitence, because it is one of the plain facts of history that again and again in the course of the centuries cruel wrongs have been inflicted in the name of Christ upon the Jewish people. Nor is any one of the great Christian bodies free of guilt in this matter. If the medieval Church had the Crusades, if Greek Orthodoxy had its pogroms, Protestantism cannot afford to be self-righteous, remembering that Hitler was preceded by Adolf Stoecker, a Lutheran Pastor, one of the most popular preachers of his day.

My experience as an examiner is that in teaching certain parts of the Bible we are treading on dangerous ground. It is not sufficient that we should ourselves be free from prejudice. We need to be on our guard against the prejudice that children bring with them into the classroom, from whatever sources they acquire it. One of our problems is that even many academic theologians are of the opinion that they have nothing to learn, that they know all there is to know about Judaism—for have they not read the Old Testament? Even so reputable a theologian as Karl Barth speaks of Judaism as having remained stagnant since 70 A.D. and it cannot be that he is ignorant of what has happened since that time. Even if he knows nothing of medieval literature and mysticism, he certainly

knows a good deal of the philosophical genius of Martin Buber today. Judaism is remarkable for its fidelity to the past, but it would not have survived on that. It also possesses a fidelity which enables it to respond with courage to changing situations.

I know that I am beginning to tread on delicate ground here. I suggest that, in teaching the New Testament, we need to correct the widespread impression that Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era was a formal and sham religion with little worth in it. The writers of the New Testament of course were engaged in detaching Christianity from Judaism. They were living at a time when the Synagogue was their most serious rival. They were concerned in stating their own position as against it. They were passing judgment on Judaism, not engaged in objective reporting.

Christianity and the Pharisees

It may be that when the conflict came between Christianity and Pharisaic Judaism, it was so acute not because the two parties were so sharply opposed but because they had so much in common that it was difficult for the one not to accuse the other of being blind to the truth. But there seems to be clear evidence from the Acts of the Apostles that, in the initial stages of Christianity, it was the Sadducees and the priests rather than the Pharisees with whom the Disciples came into conflict. It is the Pharisees who intervene when Paul is on trial in Jerusalem. If we want to make some acquaintance with the Judaism of the beginning of the Christian era and with Pharisaism in particular, we can turn on the one hand to the Psalms of Solomon and on the other to the Sayings of the Fathers. Of the sincerity of the devout Jew of the first century there need be no doubt. If the time produced some hypocrites it is also possible that it produced some saints. The prayer of the Pharisee with which we are all familiar is not unrepresentative even in its self-righteousness, but it is not the only prayer that has come down to us. There are prayers in the Jewish prayer book that go back a long way and are profound expressions of humility before the holiness of the God. I am not suggesting that the Gospels should be expurgated, that the strictures of self-righteousness and harsh judgment should be removed, but I am only suggesting that we should not defend ourselves against the challenge of these passages by saying that they refer to people of nineteen hundred years ago. We need to take them to our own hearts.

I have been speaking, however, about the situation in the first century, a situation in which Christianity was wrenching itself free from Judaism. That is not our situation today. The Jewish Synagogue is not the great

rival of the Christian Church. If anything, in face of the modern paganism, it is one of the great allies of the Christian Church.

The Crucifixion Story

Now I come to a more delicate matter still, one on which feeling runs high. That is the Crucifixion story, the presentation of the Passion narrative, and I want to begin by establishing a distinction that is not, I think, verbal only. It is a distinction of substance. The distinction is between the Crucifixion and the Cross. The Crucifixion is a historical event of which presumably a record was kept in the Roman court in Jerusalem or Caesarea. The Cross is the profound and moving significance that we who are Christians see in that event. I would like to take this opportunity to ask our Jewish friends to be very patient and very careful at this point. I quite understand what is in their minds when they ask for some retelling of the Crucifixion, but I would beg them to put their request in such language as not to lay themselves open to the suspicion that they are making an assault upon the Cross. And I would also say to those of us here who are Christians that we should not allow our reference to the Cross to enable us to evade the challenge that comes from the Jewish side, the challenge to consider whether we have, down the centuries, been in part to blame for anti-Jewish feeling by our telling of the Passion story. Whether we are in school or church, I take it that at least once a year we shall have to tell the Passion story. How are we to tell it?

My answer is quite simple: you must tell the Passion story as you must tell every story, according to what you believe are the facts. Your teaching must be based on truth and not on any sort of propaganda or with the design to create some sort of impression. It is your duty to tell what you believe are the facts.

Different interpretations

There will be divergence on this point. There will be some whose attitude to the New Testament will be such that they will be prepared to say that the Passion narrative in the Gospels is coloured to some extent by an apologetic motive, the desire to transfer the guilt of what happened from Roman to Jewish shoulders. If you believe that, then it is your duty to tell it. There will be others to whom such a view of the New Testament will be quite unacceptable. They will consider themselves bound by the narrative as it stands, with Pilate reluctant to sentence him personally and yielding to pressure from outside. If that is your view, then tell it.

I am sure it would not be wished that I should pretend that the Council of Christians and Jews ought to put out an agreed version of the Passion narrative so as to hurt nobody's feelings. We must give what we believe are the facts. But why should we give the facts so as to cause needless offence?

I put before you three considerations on this difficult but all important matter. I do not think any of them make for theological appeasement.

(i) *Historical consideration:* As I read the Gospels, it is fairly clear to me, and to many others I think, that the Jewish share in the Crucifixion is not to be ascribed to the mass of the people. It is to be ascribed to a certain quite restricted group, the High Priests of the time. According to Mark, the motives of this group were resentment at Jesus' attack on the Temple market; according to John, they were afraid that there might be Roman intervention, in which case they would suffer. But when we tell the Passion narrative there is one verse that is often overlooked. It is the verse, in Luke, that says, "That the whole multitude of those who were at Calvary and saw what happened went away beating their breasts."

(ii) *Moral consideration:* It ought to be quite impossible for us to allow anyone to entertain the notion that the Jewish people, the individual Jewish man and woman, boy and girl, with whom we have to do our work, are in some way to be held responsible and to be punished for the Crucifixion, an event of nineteen hundred years ago. That should be entirely preposterous, something we cannot consider for one moment. Once we begin to think in terms of collective guilt, of holding people responsible for what was done centuries ago, we open the doors to all sorts of inhumanity and injustice. And for Christians there is a still deeper reason. For, as Christians, the Cross of Christ is the demonstration and revelation of a love of God that goes out even to those who reject it. Therefore to make it a ground of animosity against any human group is a betrayal of that faith.

(iii) *Religious consideration:* Even, I think, in a school under the local authority we shall be discharging our duty if we tell the story of the Crucifixion with something of the meaning of the Cross shining through. The Crucifixion is in the past. The Cross is in the present too. And if we tell the Passion story as merely to expose the sins of other people nineteen centuries ago, we have told it wrongly. It is meant to expose

the Caiaphas, Judas and Pilate among ourselves today. In the novel translated from the Greek, *Christ Recrucified*, is a very powerful presentation of how Christ may be crucified afresh in the year 1954; and Christ has been crucified afresh again and again in injustice and inhumanity to the people from whom he sprang.

Whether you agree or not with what I have said, I hope you will agree that I have not tried to evade the difficulties in this matter. There may be someone who believes that the most serious difficulty has not been brought out. For him, the most serious difficulty is that what is central has no place for the Jews; that the Synagogue ignores the one whom the Church offers as the hope of the world. How are we to understand one another, to co-operate with one another when that is a fundamental difference between us? There, I think, everything turns upon whether we are willing to allow that those who differ from us so profoundly do it, not out of self-will or some vested interest, but in obedience to the truth as they see it. If we can consider one another in that light, then there should be a basis for mutual respect and understanding, and for the acceptance of each other as servants of the God who is one in spite of our divisions.

Commentary

● "Viewpoint " on Germany

A recent programme in the Television "Viewpoint" series appears to have given rise to considerable anxiety on the part of a group of representatives of the German, Swiss and Saarland Councils of Christians and Jews, meeting at a Conference in Saarbrücken a few weeks ago. Their anxiety might have been less had they been able to see the programme for themselves. Instead they were dependent on reports in certain German newspapers, which focussed attention on one item of the programme only: an interview with the former Field Marshal von Kesselring.

This interview was reported as if von Kesselring had been invited by the B.B.C. to give an address, in the course of which he was quoted as saying that the men of the former S.S. were in his view of the "kind of blood" that is needed for the German army of the future. In these circumstances it is not difficult to understand the consternation to which this report gave rise, particularly among people who still have cause to remember the atrocities committed in the name of the Nazi doctrine of "blood and soil."

The fact is that the interview with von Kesselring was only one of a series of five included in the programme which, as its producer, Mr. Aidan Crawley, M.P., explained, was designed to help the British people, called upon for the first time in a hundred years to regard Germans as friends and allies rather than as actual or potential enemies, to recognise and to understand at least some of the different points of view current in Germany today. As such the programme had everything to commend it. If we have one regret it is that our continental friends were unable to see it for themselves.

Nevertheless we should be foolish to ignore their anxiety which is prompted, not merely by newspaper reports of an English broadcast, but by symptoms in Germany itself of resurgent nationalism and anti-semitism. We have on our files a copy of a letter addressed to the Saarbrücke Council of Christians and Jews by a former leader of the Hitler Youth relating to the von Kesselring interview. Writing "in the name of a number of friends who as young people received an excellent National Socialist education and who will always stay loyal to this ideal," he refers to "the Jewish hydra which is again raising its head," and concludes by saying: "Though Adolf Hitler is dead, HIS SPIRIT LIVES. It may be that this is a voice crying in the wilderness. But it is a voice we cannot afford to ignore for we have—or should have—learned at the price of a world war and the extermination of five million Jews the folly of underestimating the dangers of fanatical minorities.

● Protestants in Czechoslovakia

The Council's library has been recently enriched by the arrival from Czechoslovakia of a collection of books published by the Central Church Publishing House in Prague. These include an edition of the Bible (including the Apocrypha), the first part of a Biblical Concordance, books of prayers, a Catechism, a translation into Czech (we believe for the first time) of Calvin's *Institutes*, together with other works by Calvin and Zwingli. Dates of publication range between 1951 and 1954.

The collection also included a handsomely produced and well illustrated brochure in English on *Czechoslovak Protestantism Today* outlining briefly the development of the Reformation in that country and describing how the various Protestant Churches are living and working there today. Enclosed with the brochure was a message from the XIth Synod Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren to Protestants throughout the world.

This message, dated October 31st, 1953, sets out clearly and with transparent sincerity, the alternative answer to the dilemma confronting the Christian in the Communist country today from that chosen by their Roman Catholic brethren. Acknowledging that they and we are living "in different social and political forms of life," the Czech Brethren appeal to Christians in the West to fight, side by side with them "for a real agreement between our nations." The real appeal is supported by a series of questions on current international affairs, addressed to themselves as well as to their fellow Christians in other countries, which serve chiefly, though perhaps unintentionally, to emphasise the extent to which Protestants in Czechoslovakia have identified themselves with the political policy of the state in which they live. They speak "in love as to our brethren" and it is obligatory on those who in "the West" receive their message to ponder it in the same spirit. Underlying all the questions posed in this message is the basic question as to what should be the attitude of the Church to a State which, if it is faithful to the fundamental principles upon which it is founded, is pledged ultimately to do away with religion. The Roman Catholic Church believes that the only possible answer is that of uncompromising opposition. The Czech Brethren, and other Protestant groups, not only in Czechoslovakia but in other Communist States also, believe a *modus vivendi* can be found. The present attitude of the Communist regimes would appear to justify the second. But it is important to remember that the present tactics of the Communist state in respect of religious affairs appear to be determined in the main by considerations of expediency. Persecution has been proved an ineffective weapon against the faith, and from the point of view of the State the granting and even the subsidising of publishing facilities and of "freedom of worship" may be a small price to pay for the advantages to be gained at home and abroad from the appearance of toleration providing always that those to whom these privileges are granted are prepared to accept the political if not the ideological infallibility of the State.

● Domestic Affairs

To describe the setting up by the United Nations of a Political Sub-Committee to enquire into the policy of racial segregation in South Africa as an unwarranted interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state is to follow a very doubtful precedent, for it was precisely on these grounds that the Nazis resisted and rejected every attack on their policy of "racial segregation" less than twenty years ago.

At first sight the objection has a certain plausibility. A sovereign state is clearly within its rights in claiming sole jurisdiction in the ordering of its internal affairs. The trouble is, of course, that internal affairs so often have external consequences. They did in the case of the Nazis. They have already done so in the case of South Africa. Coloured peoples throughout the world are in a ferment. Their growing resentment of "white domination" makes them an easy prey for all kinds of political exploitation. In the long run the instigators of the policy of "racial segregation" will discover themselves to be the victims of their own short-sightedness. As under the Nazis it was the Jews, so today it is the coloured peoples who are the "hostages of civilization."

But what is to be done? Condemnation of Mr. Strydom and his colleagues is not enough. The problems of South Africa are much more complex than appears to the outsider. If the coloured peoples of the Union have a right to our sympathy, so have the white. We may disapprove of their policies; we may deplore their theology; but we cannot afford to ignore or to minimise their fears, or to oversimplify the circumstances, real or imagined, which give rise to them. Understanding of the situation in all its aspects is perhaps the greatest need of the present, the kind of understanding that grows not merely from the reading of full and up-to-date information, but from the cleansing of our own hearts and minds from every root of prejudice and bitterness, whether against the white man or his coloured neighbour.

● Human Rights for Refugees

The sixth anniversary of the adoption by the United Nations Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights seemed a singularly appropriate occasion for the announcement in one of our leading daily papers of a "New Deal" for refugees. For there are few if any sections of the human family whose human rights more urgently need recognition than the still almost frighteningly large groups of refugees in various parts of the world.

The "new deal," which is the result of the work of the United Nations Refugee Advisory Committee, envisages the setting up by the Economic and Social Council of an inter-governmental executive committee to oversee the policies and activities of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. It also lays down that a fund of 16 million dollars should be made available to find permanent solutions, approved by Governments, for the refugees under the United Nations Mandate before the High Commissioner's term of office expires in 1958.

It must be remembered, however, that this "new deal" to which all men of goodwill will wish all possible success, relates only to refugees who remain in Europe; a number in the neighbourhood of one million, of whom some 350,000 are still without stable employment or immediate prospect of resettlement and of whom about 83,000 are still in camps. The scheme does not cover, for example, the Palestinian refugees of whom, according to the last count, some 492,763 are still in 24 camps being kept alive by the United Nations Welfare and Relief Administration on the basis of a monthly ration of \$1.61 worth of food per head. The particular tragedy of this situation, according to a correspondent of *The Times* lately in Arab Palestine, is that these unfortunate people have come to be regarded as "the Arab States' instrument of pressure on Israel, via the tender consciences of the United States and Great Britain. So the more refugees the better from Jordan's point of view."

The complexities of this tragic situation have been a frequent subject of comment in these pages. But if there is unlikely to be any quick and easy solution, this at least is certain, that until the problem is approached by all the parties concerned in the spirit and according to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights there can be no hope of any solution at all.

About Ourselves

● On Tuesday, November 2nd, by the kind invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Neville J. Laski and through the courtesy of the Gentlemen of the Mahamad of the Congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews, a party of some 70 members and friends of the Council were entertained at the 250 years old Bevis Marks Synagogue, the oldest Synagogue in this country, and an "ancient monument" of quite absorbing interest. The story of the Synagogue was briefly told by Mr. R. D. Barnett, Deputy Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities at the British Museum, who also introduced and explained some of its ritual treasures. A tour of the Synagogue itself was conducted by Mr. I. D. Duque. Between them these two gentlemen succeeded in holding the interest of a fascinated audience for longer, we suspect, than either they or their visitors

realised or expected! An enthralling evening which it is hoped to follow up by visits to other shrines of historic interest, including Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral and Wesley's Chapel. Special thanks on this occasion were not only due but gratefully expressed to Mr. and Mrs. Laski, with whom the idea originated and who so generously and charmingly entertained the party to tea.

● On Thursday, December 30th, the Council is arranging a special meeting during the Conference of Educational Associations. The general theme of this year's Conference is "Education and the Family," and the Council's meeting, which will be addressed by Mr. H. P. D. Lee, M.A., Headmaster of Winchester College, will have as its subject "Religious Education in Schools and its relation to Family

Life." Professor J. A. Lauwerys will preside. The meeting will be held at 3.0 p.m. in the Chemistry C.8 Room, University College, Gower Street, W.C.1. It will be open to the public, and all readers of *Common Ground* will be most welcome.

● 150 school boys and girls from eight grammar schools—state and denominational—recently had a day out to attend a conference on "Man's Dependence on Man," organised jointly by the Council for Education in World Citizenship and the Council of Citizens of East London, and held at County Hall, the home of the London County Council.

The day's events included the showing of films which left no doubt as to the amount of human misery caused by prejudice between different human groups, and a Brains Trust; but most impressive and stimulating were the discussion groups into which the conference divided. Among the questions raised in these groups were the need for religion in a harmonious world community, and for equality of educational opportunity regardless of colour or faith, the dangers arising from mixed marriages, and the problem of Apartheid.

● A Bring-and-Buy-Sale arranged by Miss Alma Royalton-Kisch at her home provided a pleasant social

occasion for friends and supporters of the Council in London, and added about £50 to the Council's funds. This was the second function of this kind that Miss Royalton-Kisch has arranged on the Council's behalf, and we are most grateful to her, and to her helpers, for their splendid effort.

● The Hull Council of Christians and Jews held its Annual General Meeting on November 15th, with the Lord Mayor of Hull in the Chair. The Hull Council continues with a useful programme of activities, not least a series of visits to schools by its Joint-Chairmen, Canon A. E. Foster and Mr. Lionel Rosen. We welcome Mr. D. L. Wilkes as a new Joint-Secretary of the Hull branch, in succession to Mr. Norman Shenker, who has had to resign owing to the pressure of his many other engagements.

● The Central Jewish Lecture Committee, with which the Council of Christians and Jews frequently co-operates, recently held the second Jaques Cohen Memorial Lecture. The Lecturer was Professor J. A. Lauwerys, of the London Institute of Education, and his subject, "Education for Harmony." We look forward to seeing the lecture published, and shall hope to review it in a future number of *Common Ground*.

Book Notes

Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950.

By V. D. Lipman

(Watts, 18s.)

This short survey of a hundred years' history of a specialised group might have been purely factual and statistical, and therefore dull. But the author, an expert on English local government, is far too shrewd and versatile a man to have fallen into this particular trap. The result is that he has contrived to

produce a work which is authoritative and well substantiated at every stage and at the same time provides for the general reader a sociological study of exceptional interest.

The astonishing facts that emerge from these pages are that, during the period under review, the Jewish community in this country increased from 35,000 to something like 450,000, that the influx consisted of foreign refugees who came from a totally different cultural background, not knowing a word of English, and that the whole of this process went on without causing

any perceptible disturbance in the national or local scene. The credit for this happy outcome of what might have been a serious social problem is due partly to the average Englishman's good-natured tolerance, partly to the wisdom and loyalty to this country of a succession of Anglo-Jewish leaders whose communal aim was social assimilation without loss of religious integrity.

Naturally this book will have a special interest for Jewish readers who will learn how the majority of their forbears adapted themselves to English life in all its various spheres, economic, social, educational and political. They will see how their own religious and charitable institutions came into existence and how, in certain directions, schismatic movements developed. In particular they will realise how much the Anglo-Jewish community of today owes to the vision and public spirit of its former leaders, notably Lionel Louis Cohen. Perhaps it is not altogether an accident that of the latter's grandchildren one is now Governor of Uganda, another a Lord of Appeal, and a third Principal of Newnham College, Cambridge. The social integration of a small, immigrant community has indeed reached an astonishing climax.

The Zadokite Documents

By Chaim Rabin

(Oxford University Press, 21s. 0d.)

With the ever-growing interest in the literature of the Jewish religious community that produced the extra-biblical writings discovered at Ain Feshkha, the fragments brought by Salomo Schechter from Cairo to Cambridge and edited by him as a "Zadokite Work" have assumed a new significance. It may be considered as established that the medieval manuscripts from Al Fushtat are based on a document which emanated from the same community as that to which we owe the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Dr. Rabin's new edition of the two manuscripts from the Taylor-Schechter Collection will therefore be welcomed in the scholarly world. The editor was in a position not only to compare biblical and rabbinical references with the contents of the "Zadokite Work," but he used for this purpose also the

more closely related *Manuel of Discipline*, the *Habakkuk Commentary* and, to some extent, the *Book of the Wars of the Children of Light* against the *Children of Darkness*. The modest-looking notes in the apparatus of Dr. Rabin's edition give testimony to extensive and wearing studies, carefully done and judiciously presented. Dr. Rabin professes that his notes are "purely philological" and aim at no more than assisting a correct understanding of the text by adducing parallels from cognate writings. The writer's discretion in keeping above the din of battle amongst scholars about date and origin of the document with which he is dealing induced him to refrain from volunteering any historical or exegetical analysis. This modest profession of aims is, no doubt, only partly unfeigned. By dividing the text into what Dr. Rabin styles "a collection of proof-texts" and a set of rules, the editor has gone a long way towards providing an exegetical interpretation.

It is perhaps too early to judge the merits of Dr. Rabin's edition. It will retain its value as a useful hand-book even if more comprehensive and more bold attempts are made to explore the contents and explain the composition and purport of the "Zadokite Fragments." It will be interesting to compare the present edition with one, from an entirely different aspect, that is being prepared by the American scholar Isaac Rabinowitz.

An Essay on Racial Tension

By Philip Manson

(Royal Institute of International Affairs, 8s. 6d.)

This book is to be commended for the ordinary student of world affairs who is disturbed by the ever increasing threat of racial conflict and wants an objective, easily read exposition of this phenomenon and its causes. He will find that the ground covered in less than 150 pages is amazingly wide, that the problem is far more complex than he had supposed, and that, in the author's opinion, there are no simple, universally applicable solutions. In fact the only positive recommendation made is that a series of territorial studies should be undertaken "so that we may come to know more of what each group wants and fears."

Those who approach this subject from a strongly moral or emotional standpoint will inevitably be disappointed with these somewhat arid and tentative conclusions. But throughout his survey, and particularly when he is dealing with the South African scene, the author tries to understand and do justice to the motives of all the conflicting groups. He is careful to show what moral judgments have to be made but he is extremely chary of making them. The most valuable part of the essay is that which distinguishes between a primitive society based on status and the free society of competition and contract. Much of the world's unrest is, no doubt, due to the growing pains which accompany development from the one to the other but the constant attempts at stabilisation on the part of the powerful privileged group are bound to raise feelings of moral indignation not only among those affected but in the minds of all enlightened people, and for this Mr. Mason hardly makes sufficient allowance.

English History through Foreign Eyes

By J. W. Hunt, M.A.

(Published for the Historical Association
by George Philip & Son, Ltd., 1s. 6d.)

This short pamphlet will be of special interest to those who have read the Council's recent publication, "History without Bias?" It shows, by means of a number of translated excerpts, how certain episodes or phases of English history have been treated in contemporary foreign textbooks. The selection covers a wide variety of countries and periods, and ranges over all the more important aspects of human affairs.

For the ordinary reader, the main interest of this document will be to discover how far the writer's national or ideological bias has tended to colour his description of historical events. From this point of view the most revealing passages are those which deal with situations in which the writer's country was in conflict with our own. We should not perhaps expect a French account of Joan of Arc, a Spanish, of the Armada, or a Russian, of the

Crimean War, to tally with corresponding accounts in English textbooks. Yet a perusal of these passages is, in the main, reassuring: for they give the general impression that, at least with regard to the remoter historical events, there is a genuine attempt at fairness and the avoidance of distortion.

Colour Bar

By Learie Constantine

(Stanley Paul & Co., Ltd., 12s. 6d.)

Anything that Mr. Constantine writes is entitled to respect and we can be grateful for the fact that this particular "cobbler" has not stuck to his last. True, it is as the "happy warrior" of the cricket field that he has justly earned his popularity in this country. But much of his life has been devoted to a tougher and more serious kind of warfare—the struggle to gain acceptance and equality for the coloured peoples—and this has led him into a considerable piece of sociological research of which this volume is the fruit.

It succeeds, as might have been expected, in making out a devastating case against the white man, his selfishness and arrogance, his callousness and desire to exploit wherever he has been in contact with coloured peoples. It also shows that in every field of human activity, industrial, political, professional, artistic and athletic, coloured men and women have excelled whenever they have had the chance. It claims that all the great founders of religion including Jesus himself were men of coloured skin—"no great religion has ever been founded by a white man."

When however, he comes to the question of remedies, Mr. Constantine, as is, perhaps, natural in the circumstances, allows himself to be carried away by such an intense emotionalism that he ceases, at times, to maintain any contact with the world of reality. To that extent the book has failed to make a valid contribution to the solving of the most acute sociological problem of our time. Readers of *Common Ground* know only too well that there is no facile cure for intolerance and that the over-simplified assumptions with regard to human depravity, so often made in

this book, which ignore the handicaps inherited by each generation, do not help towards a solution of the problem. Nevertheless the author has given us a fine sermon, which may even penetrate as far as his particular bugbear, the Colonial Office, and help us to strive more strenuously in every practical way towards the ideal of a united humanity.

The Diary of a Young Girl

By Anne Frank
(Pan Books Ltd., 2s.)

Pan Books are to be congratulated on having produced this sensitive, deeply moving piece of autobiography in such a readily accessible form. Public opinion is divided about the desirability of keeping the interest in Nazi atrocities alive and, as was pointed out in a recent issue of *Common Ground*, there is a certain danger in prolonging the emotional climate which they inevitably produce. But these random jottings of

a German-Jewish girl of fourteen, shut up for two years in a "secret annexe" in Amsterdam and finally carried off to her death at Auschwitz, stand on their own merits and have something of importance to say about life and its problems quite apart from the special conditions which caused them to be written.

For we are brought here into intimate contact with a girl of quite astonishing vitality and intellectual perception. It is true that she appears at times precocious, morbidly introspective, even priggish. But she was, also, possessed of a gaiety of spirit and a capacity for moral courage which lift her out of the daily scenes of neurotic emotionalism characteristic of a "prison" life and reveal a personality built in nothing less than heroic proportions. All this is finally epitomised in her message to her Jewish fellow-sufferers—"Be brave! Let us remain aware of our task and not grumble, a solution will come. God has never deserted our people."

OUR EAST LONDON HOW WE CAME HERE

Published for the Schools'
Committee of the Council
of Citizens of East London

The story of the different peoples who have come as immigrants into the East End of London during the last four hundred years, and how they have contributed to the richness of its life.

PRICE 6D. (7½d. post free)

FROM

The
Council of Christians and Jews
KINGSWAY CHAMBERS,
162A, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2.

JACQUES HEIM



**Craven 'A' for smooth,
clean smoking**

"Common Ground" is published by Newman Wolsey Ltd., of 4, Holborn Place, W.C.1, on behalf of the Council of Christians and Jews, and is printed by the Holborn Press of Holborn Place W.C.1.

